

| | |
|--------|------------------------------|
| ID. | Date of interview |
| date | 29/12/19 |
| ID. | Time interview started |
| start | 19:14:57 |
| ID.end | Completion date of interview |
| Date | 29/12/19 |
| ID.end | Time interview ended |
| | 19:26:24 |
| ID. | Duration of interview |
| time | 11.45 |

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Recruitment. For most people in the UK, the decision to hire or reject someone for a career post is more important to them than their medical data. As just one example, the reason for rejecting someone is often thought to be due to prejudice - they have one of the Protected Characteristics as outlined in the Equality Act of 2010 - or an inaccurate assessment of their skill to do the job interviewed for. In both cases, it is vital for both employer and candidate to have access to the real reasons. In every case, this is very sensitive personal data to the candidate. For the employer, they need to ensure that decisions are not made based upon prejudice, and that hiring decision-makers are doing a good job of assessing candidates' skills correctly. I would appreciate being requesting to write the ICO a detailed document on this issue that adversely affects millions of people every year.

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

As above

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - Not at all useful | 2 – Slightly useful | 3 – Moderately useful | 4 – Very useful | 5 – Extremely useful |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q6 Why have you given this score?

It is fairly thorough and quite comprehensive

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

To add the issue of Recruitment

Q9 Are you answering as:

- ☐ An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- ☒ An individual acting in a professional capacity
- ☐ On behalf of an organisation
- ☐ Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

networx recruitment

What sector are you from:

recruitment marketing

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ☐ ICO Twitter account
- ☐ ICO Facebook account
- ☐ ICO LinkedIn account
- ☐ ICO website
- ☐ ICO newsletter
- ☐ ICO staff member
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Personal/work Twitter account
- ☐ Personal/work Facebook account
- ☐ Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ☐ Other

If other please specify: